

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE     | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 10/735,147   | 12/12/2003      | Benjamin Atkin       | 51289/JEJ/D359          | 1566             |
| 23363  | 7590 07/13/2006 |                      | EXAMINER                |                  |
| CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP<br>PO BOX 7068<br>PASADENA, CA 91109-7068 |                 |                      | O'CONNOR, CARY E        |                  |
|  |                 |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER     |
| ,  |                 |                      | 3732                    |                  |
|  |                 |                      | DATE MAILED: 07/13/2006 |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



## Application No. Applicant(s) 10/735,147 ATKIN ET AL. Interview Summary Examiner Art Unit Cary E. O'Connor 3732 All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Cary E. O'Connor. (3)\_\_\_\_. (2) Jun-Young Jeon (4) . Date of Interview: 05 July 2006. Type: a) ✓ Telephonic b) ✓ Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_. Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 14. Identification of prior art discussed: Sharp, Winston. Agreement with respect to the claims f) $\square$ was reached. g) $\boxtimes$ was not reached. h) $\square$ N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Disscussed the differences between the prior art and the instant invention. It was suggested that the claims could be amended to specify that the O-ring is located in the vicinity of the connection of the connecting body and the tip. It was agreed that the prior art of record does not show this... (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. imary Examiner Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action. Examiner's signature, if required